

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-5 are all the claims pending in the application.

**Statement of Substance of Interview**

The undersigned thanks the Examiner for conducting the interview on April 27, 2010. During the interview, the rejection of claims 1-5 in view of LeCain was discussed. The Examiner noted that LeCain's bead 574 was being relied on as disclosing a spacer. However, because claim 1 recites "spacers" in plural, it was agreed that LeCain did not disclose all of the features recited in claim 1.

It is respectfully submitted that the instant STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW complies with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. §§1.2 and 1.133 and MPEP §713.04.

At the Examiner's request, Applicants further amend claim 1 to clearly recite "a plurality of spacers."

**Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)**

Claims 1-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by LeCain (WO/03/104884).

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, a plurality of spacers are arranged on a surface of at least one of the front substrate and the rear substrate in a sealing agent arranging portion, which seals a space between the front substrate and the rear substrate by a sealing agent; and

the sealing agent arranging portion is disposed between outermost walls of partition walls for forming cells and a rib disposed on at least one of the front substrate and the rear substrate.

As a basis for the rejection, the Examiner, relying on FIG. 17, reads bead 572 as corresponding to the recited rib, and bead 574 as corresponding to the recited "spacers."

However, bead 574 is a continuous bead that works in tandem with bead 572 to create a “channel” seal 570. *See* LeCain, p. 42, lines 5-12. Thus, even if bead 574 could be construed as a spacer, the claim recites spacers in plural, i.e., meaning more than one spacer. Conversely, bead 574 is a single bead running along the length of the channel.

For at least this reason, Applicants submit claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over LeCain. Further, claims 2-5 are allowable, at least by virtue of their dependency.

**Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/David P. Emery/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: May 10, 2010

---

David P. Emery  
Registration No. 55,154